



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,969	07/08/2003	Dennis P. Schwartz	13754:11	8787
62460	7590	10/17/2007		
ROBERT MCLAUCHLAN P.O. BOX 26780 AUSTIN, TX 78755			EXAMINER DASS, HARISH T	
			ART UNIT 3692	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/17/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/614,969

Applicant(s)

SCHWARTZ ET AL.

Examiner

Harish T. Dass

Art Unit

3692

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3692

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Broadbent et al. (hereinafter Broadbent – US 2001/0047326) in view of Florance et al. (hereinafter Florance – US 7,076,452).

Re. Claims, 1, 9 and 17, Broadbent discloses computer implemented method, and system for preparing loan documents:

storing data and procedures for processing said data provided by a mortgage originator in a first database; storing data and procedures for processing said data provided by an investor in at least one additional database; comparing data provided by said mortgage originator to data provided by said investor [read entire document particularly at minimum, paragraphs 11, 19];

identifying discrepancies between said data provided by said mortgage originator and said investor [para. 275]; supplying additional information to prepare the documents to a documentation preparation engine [para. 20]; a compliance engine that determines if (examiner note: conditional language, not positively claimed) said reconciled data and said additional information are consistent with said procedures for processing said data provided by said mortgage originator and said investor, and wherein noncompliant

reconciled data or additional information is reconciled and delivering said populated documents for execution [para. 51, 64-68, 127].

Broadbent does not explicitly disclose reconciling said discrepancies; auditing said reconciled discrepancies and populating data and additional information consistent with procedures for processing said data provided by said mortgage originator and said investor into documents contained within a forms library. However, Florance discloses reconciling said discrepancies; auditing (examining) said reconciled discrepancies and populating data and additional information consistent with procedures for processing said data provided by said mortgage originator and said investor into documents contained within a forms library [see entire document, at minimum see, col. 20 lines 49-65, col. 29 lines 52-60, col. 59 lines 45-61]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Broadbent and include reconciling said discrepancies; auditing (examining and underwriting) said reconciled discrepancies and populating data and additional information consistent with procedures for processing said data provided by said mortgage originator and said investor into documents contained within a forms library, as disclosed by Florance, to correlate data, and databases for facilitating for real estate loan applications and manipulating the data for examination for processing a loan application and underwriting.

Re. Claims, 18-27, Broadbent discloses wherein said mortgage originator enters data into said first database via a software package [para. 11, 25], wherein said

Art Unit: 3692

procedures for processing said data provided by said mortgage broker and said investor comprise business rules and or compliance requirements [para. 51], wherein said comparison engine writes said reconciled data to said first database or said at least one additional database [inherently record can be added, deleted to database], wherein said at least one additional database comprises at least one database selected from the group consisting of property tax databases, independent property valuations databases, income/employment verification databases, income tax databases, and credit databases [para. 24], wherein said business rules comprise investor business rules, regulatory compliance requirements, or insurability requirements [para. 24], compliance requirements are issued by at least one entity selected from the group consisting of federal government agencies, state governments, local governments, banking regulators, FHA, VA, and FNMA/FHLMC [para. 13, 25], re-auditing (recheck) and allowing said broker to select additional documents from said forms library [Figure 4D and associated description].

Florance further discloses manipulating individual data fields within said populated documents, documents are populated automatically, re-auditing the documents with said compliance engine and reconciling discrepancies created by manipulating individual data fields within said populated documents, reconciling discrepancies created by adding additional documents and creating create database sets [see above]. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosure of Broadbent and include reconciling said discrepancies; auditing (examining and underwriting) said reconciled discrepancies

and populating data and additional information consistent with procedures for processing said data provided by said mortgage originator and said investor into documents contained within a forms library, as disclosed by Florance, to correlate data, and databases for facilitating for real estate loan applications and manipulating the data for examination for processing a loan application and underwriting.

The dependent system claims 2-8 and 10-16 include the similar limitations of the method claims, therefore rejected with same rational as method claims, above.

Conclusion

Claims 1-27 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harish T. Dass whose telephone number is 571-272-6793. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM to 4:50 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Abdi Kambiz can be reached on 571-272-6702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3692

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harish T Dass
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3692

Harish T Dass

10/14/07